Class 20: Course wrap-up

(after we discuss Murut)

1. Reduplication and other prosodic phonology

- Over- and underapplication and backcopying as arguments for a *correspondence* relation between base and reduplication—opens the door for other types of correspondence (base-truncate, output-output, word-internal in the absence of reduplicative structure...).
 - Word-internal example: aggressive reduplication (Zuraw 2002)
 - Expanded correspondence has some undesirable consequences for computation, and some have sought to limit correspondence to Input-Output relations, and a subset of those.
- Competing theories of B-R similarity: multiple precedence, double generation
- The Kager-Hamilton problem argues against reduplicants as templates. Rather, their size should come from TETU rankings of size-restricting constraints. But accounting for duplemic size differences seems to require distinguishing MAX-C-BR₁ from MAX-C-BR₂, etc.
- Does the reduplicant see the base? Evidence is mixed. Most cases where the reduplicant is more faithful than the base look kind of alike and have been analyzed with existential faithfulness and as infixation.
- Fixed segmentism in reduplicants: some can be analyzed as TETU, some as overwriting.
- The evidence from reduplication and truncation mainly points to (descriptive) prosodic templates: the truncate aims to be, say, a foot, even if what it copies is not a foot (or any constituent) in the base. Supports the psychological reality of units like "foot".

2. Antifaithfulness and anticorrespondence

- Alderete's antifaithfulness: a morphology-sensitive constraint requires that, say IDENT(nas)-OO be violated somewhere in the word. It is up to the grammar to determine where the best place for the violation to fall is, or whether a violation will get realized at all.
- Hayes's anticorrespondence: morphology-sensitive constraints specify the change that must occur from one output to a related one. This is more powerful than antifaithfulness but seems to be needed for many cases.
- Evidence from loan phonology suggests that people are capable of learning fairly arbitrary mappings.
- Anticorrespondence seems to me to be a good candidate for the language-specific component of *Con* (the constraint set).

3. Lexical phonology effects in OT

- O-O correspondence can handle cyclicity and some opacity
- Kiparsky argues, though, that a stratal (LPM-OT) approach gives a more unified account of, for example, why epenthetic vowels in Arabic are invisible to so much phonology (because they're inserted at a postlexical level).
- Still no unified account of non-derived-environment blocking (but see McCarthy on Comparative Markedness).

4. Similarity-based correspondence

• Steriade proposes that faithfulness constraints refer to very fine-grained contexts, and their ranking is projected from a p-map that speakers have access to. The greater a perceptual

difference violating a faithfulness constraint creates, the higher the constraint is default-ranked.

- Default rankings can be overturned in the learner by language-specific evidence, so we need to look to less conventionalized corners of phonology to be sure we're seeing default rankings: loan nativizations (though as we saw, these can become conventionalized too), poetry, puns, real or lab-created language games.
- Some recent evidence challenging the idea that output-output comparisons are solely perceptual: "articulatory paradigm uniformity" in Hungarian vowel harmony (Gafos & Benus)

5. Basehood

- Can any two words be related by output-output correspondence, or is it...
 - only adjacent steps in morphological derivation (Kager)
 - only a designated member of the paradigm with every other member (Albright)—with no I-O correspondence and listing of exceptions (i.e., the learner doesn't attempt to find a single underlying form that works for everything)
 - even many-to-one relations (split base: Burzio, Steriade)

6. Markedness and allomorph choice

- In many cases, we can't derive all allomorphs from a single underlying representation.
- Sometimes we can list the allomorphs and let the grammar pick the most harmonic one in every situation.
- But sometimes (Timugon Murut?) we need additional machinery to ensure that some allomorph is preferred even when not the least marked (e.g., MacBride's FiatStruc)

7. Ineffability

- Where do paradigm gaps come from? Perhaps multiple sources.
 - no reliable rules available (Albright)
 - the null parse does better in the constraint ranking (Prince & Smolensky, Raffelsiefen)
 - componentiality: the grammar yields one option, but it fails on, say, a markedness constraint housed in another component; instead of picking the next-best candidate, the derivation just crashes (Orgun & Sprouse, Hayes)
- What's the relationship of what the person actually says (perhaps a paraphrase) to the gap? Does a crash in the phonology send the derivation back to the syntax or earlier for another try (and if so, how do we make sure we get a different result this time)? Or is the whole derivation done in one component whose input is purely semantic (and if so, how do we limit the flow of information so that it's overwhelmingly "downward")?

8. Exemplars and neighborhoods

- Bybee's usage-based phonology proposes that lexical entries are very detailed—are perhaps even large collections of exemplars. Aspects of word use like frequency can therefore affect an individual word's phonetics.
- This has applications in the problem of phonologization (see Kirchner): How do phonetically motivated rules get extended to similar contexts where they're not motivated (e.g., utterance-final devoicing → word-final devoicing; lenition in fast speech → obligatory lenition rule)?

9. Evolutionary phonology

- Blevins & Garrett: in order to ascribe a role to phonetics in synchronic phonology (or acquisition—either way, *in* people's heads), we must show that key cases can't be explained by diachronic forces that are not themselves phonetically teleological (such as likelihood of misperception in certain environments).
- Objection from Steriade: we have to look at (and accumulate) experimental findings on misperception. For example, while it's true that a preobstruent nasal's place of articulation is easily misperceived, it doesn't seem to be misperceived in the direction of assimilation.

Where can you go from here?

Related courses (* = class offered next year, as far as I know)

- ***203**: Phonetic theory
- ***204**: Experimental phonetics
- **205**: Morphological theory
- *C208, 218: Mathematical structures in linguistics
- ***C209A,B**: Computational linguistics
- ***210A,B**: Field methods
- C211: Intonation
- **212**: Learnability theory
- *C232: Language processing
- *C233: Language development
- ***C235**: Neurolinguistics
- 236: Computational phonology
- ***251A,B**: proseminars in phonetics and phonology: in-depth course on a particular topic
- ***261A,B,C**: phonology seminar: informal talk series

Email

- The Optimal List: Low-volume email list about phonology and OT. Not available on the web. Go to http://roa.rutgers.edu/optimal-list.php3
- Subscribe to phonlab, the p-lab's low-volume email list (ask Sahyang (sahyang@ucla.edu)). You can talk to Pat about getting keys to the lab, too.

Talks

- See http://www.linguistics.ucla.edu/colloquia/ for UCLA schedules
- See http://www.usc.edu/dept/LAS/linguistics/ (scroll down to 'Events') for colloquia and PHON lunch at USC.

Fridays at Lu Valle

From 3:30 to 4:00 every Friday in the summer, people in the p-lab gather outside Lu Valle for a beverage and a chat.

The End